

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 13 and 27 have been amended.

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Trembley, which was cited as disclosing an assembly similar to that of Briles, with an internal shoulder having a surface defining a continuous annular well. The Examiner indicated that as to Briles, the "collar" is read to be inclusive of the member (14), the captive washer. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a "one-piece" swage collar. Claims 13 and 27 have been similarly amended. Support for the amendment can be found in the Figs 1-4E. Briles discloses at column 5, lines 20-23, that the washer 14 is captive on the nut, but is freely rotatable relative to the nut, so that the nut and washer are clearly not made as one piece, but are separate pieces between which the seal insert can be forced, as shown in Fig. 4 of Briles. Trembley also discloses at column 3, lines 54-57 that the nut 12 is permitted to rotate with respect to the captive washer 14, so that the nut and washer are also clearly not made as one piece, but are separate pieces between which the seal insert can be disposed, as shown in Figs. 1-3 of Trembley.

It is respectfully submitted that the one-piece nature of the swage collar is important for bringing the sealing element into tight sealing engagement with the pin as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 and described in the specification at page 8, line 5. It is respectfully submitted that Briles and Trembley, either taken separately or in

combination, do not teach, disclose or suggest a one-piece swage collar, as is claimed, and that Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 are novel and inventive over Briles and Trembley. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Trembley should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Trembley in view of Briles, discussed above. Briles was cited as disclosing a swage-type fastener. However, it is respectfully submitted that Briles and Trembley, either taken separately or in combination, do not teach, disclose or suggest a one-piece swage collar, as is claimed, and that Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 are novel and inventive over Briles and Trembley. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 on the grounds of obviousness from Trembley in view of Briles should be withdrawn.

Claims 27, 28, 31, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles or modified Trembley in view of Armour, cited to disclose the process in which a collar having an internal diameter larger than a pin is positioned on the pin, then plastically deformed inwardly to engage the shaft of the pin by a swaging tool. Claim 27 recites "a swage tool which mechanically forces the collar over the pin ... tightly sealing the sealing ring entirely within the well of the internal shoulder of the collar between the internal shoulder of the collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the pin." It is respectfully submitted that Briles, Trembley and Armour

do not teach, disclose or suggest tightly sealing a sealing ring entirely within a well of an internal shoulder of a one-piece collar between the internal shoulder of the collar and the shaft of the fastener, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 27, 28, 31, 33 and 34 are novel and inventive over Briles, Trembley and Armour, either taken separately or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 27, 28, 31, 33 and 34 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles or Trembley in view of Armour should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 39 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles or modified Trembley in view of Rath, which was cited as disclosing a collar made of aluminum or titanium. The Examiner also mentioned, but did not apply, Armour. Claim 39 has not been filed. Claims 5 and 6 depend from Claim 1, Claims 18 and 19 depend from Claim 13, and Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 27. It is respectfully submitted that modified Briles, modified Trembley, and Rath do not teach, disclose or suggest tightly sealing an internal sealing insert entirely in the well of a one-piece swage collar between the internal shoulder of the swage collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the fastener, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 are novel and inventive over Briles, Trembley, and Rath, either taken separately or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles or Trembley in view of Rath should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles or modified Trembley, further in view of Breed, which

was cited as disclosing a rounded groove and flange. Claims 11 and 12 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 13. It is respectfully submitted that Briles and Breed do not teach, disclose or suggest tightly sealing an internal sealing insert entirely in the well of a one-piece swage collar between the internal shoulder of the swage collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the fastener, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 are novel and inventive over Briles, Trembley and Breed, either taken separately or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles or Trembley in view of Breed should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: 

James W. Paul
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/rvw

Encls.: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201
132136.1